

8.10 Socioeconomics

This section discusses the environmental setting, consequences, regional and local impacts, and mitigation measures associated with the socioeconomic aspects of the Sun Valley Energy Project (SVEP) project. Section 8.10.1 describes the environment that may be affected by SVEP construction and operation. Section 8.10.2 identifies environmental impacts from development of the power plant, including environmental justice issues. Section 8.10.3 discusses cumulative impacts. Mitigation measures are discussed in Section 8.10.4 while the laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) applicable to socioeconomics are presented in Section 8.10.5. Section 8.10.6 presents the agencies involved and provides agency contacts. Section 8.10.7 presents the required permits and permitting schedule. Section 8.10.8 lists references cited or consulted in preparing this section.

The proposed SVEP will be located in an unincorporated area of Riverside County, near the community of Romoland 22 miles south of Riverside, south and east of Perris, and east of Sun City. Although the project site is zoned industrial, existing uses on the site and surrounding the site are agricultural. New residential and industrial development is planned for surrounding areas. Low-density residential uses are intermixed within the agricultural lands located south of the project site. High-density residential areas are generally concentrated north of the project site in the community of Romoland, and to the east and southeast in new developments.

8.10.1 Affected Environment

8.10.1.1 Population

Riverside County is bordered to the west by Orange County, to the north by San Bernardino County, to the east by the State of Arizona, and to the south by San Diego and Imperial counties. Riverside County's current (as of January 1, 2005) population is estimated at 1,877,000 persons (California Department of Finance [DOF], 2005a). Historical and projected population data for the nearby communities and Riverside County are summarized in Table 8.10-1. During the 1990s, Riverside County's population increased at an average annual rate of 2.8 percent, whereas the State of California grew at an annual rate of 1.0 percent.

TABLE 8.10-1
Historical and Projected Population Estimates*

Area	1990	2000	2010 (p)	2020 (p)	2030 (p)
Perris	21,460	36,203	63,440	76,501	88,683
Riverside	226,505	255,093	307,847	338,712	367,489
Romoland CDP	2,378	2,564	NA	NA	NA
Sun City CDP	14,930	17,850	NA	NA	NA
Riverside County	1,170,413	1,545,387	2,085,432	2,644,278	3,143,468
California	29,758,213	34,043,198	39,246,767	43,851,741	48,110,671

Source: Department of Finance (DOF), 2005a.

* Populations rounded to nearest 100.

CDP = Census-Designated Place

(p) = projected

Based on population projections by the DOF, Riverside County and California are expected to have their greatest population growth from 2000 to 2010. Historically, the County's growth rate has been increasing at a slightly higher rate than that of the state. However, population growth in the future is expected to decline. Annual average compounded population growth rates are summarized in Table 8.10-2.

TABLE 8.10-2
Historical and Projected Average Compounded Growth Rates

Area	1990-2000 (%)	2000-2010 (%)	2010-2020 (%)	2020-2030 (%)
Perris	5.4	5.8	1.9	1.5
Riverside	1.2	1.9	1.0	0.8
Romoland CDP	0.8	NA	NA	NA
Sun City CDP	1.8	NA	NA	NA
Riverside County	2.8	3.0	2.4	1.7
California	1.3	1.4	1.1	0.9

8.10.1.2 Minority and Low Income Populations

Table 8.10-3 summarizes the minority and Hispanic¹ and low-income population distributions for the census tracts that are within a 6-mile radius of SVEP. The minority and income data are from the 2000 U.S. Census. The table also compares this data with equivalent data for Riverside County, the communities neighboring Romoland (by zip code), and California as a whole.

TABLE 8.10-3
Income and Race, California, Riverside County, Census Tracts Within 6 Miles, and Neighboring Communities

Location	Total Population	Non-White Population (%)	Hispanic Population (any race) (%)	Household Median Income (1999 dollars)	Percent Below Poverty
California	33,871,648	40.5	32.4	47,493	14.2
Riverside County	1,511,153	30.7	36.2	42,887	14.2
Census tracts w/in 6 miles	118,329	44.6	33.4	39,407	14.3
Neighboring communities	31,092	-	-	-	-
Romoland (ZIP code 92585)	8,674	24.2	34.1	36,118	13.6
Sun City (ZIP code 92586)	18,142	8.3	12.4	29,152	8.9
Homeland (ZIP code 92548)	4,276	16.9	28.8	22,095	23.6

Source: 2000 Census.

¹Hispanics or Latinos are those people who classified themselves in one of the specific Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino categories listed on the Census 2000 questionnaire—"Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban"—as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino." People who identify their origin as "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" may be of any race. Thus, the percent Hispanic should not be added to percentages for racial (i.e., minority) categories.

8.10.1.2.1 Minority Populations

Table 8.10-4 shows the minority and Hispanic-origin population distribution among the 23 census tracts that are entirely or partly within a 6-mile radius of SVEP (2000 U.S. Census). Of the overall total population within the 6-mile radius, approximately 45 percent are minority, 33 percent are of Hispanic origin. Of the 23 census tracts, 7 have minority populations that are above 50 percent. With respect to Hispanic origin, 5 of the 23 census tracts are more than 50 percent Hispanic origin.

TABLE 8.10-4
Distribution of Minority and Hispanic Population by Census Tracts Within a 6-Mile Radius

Tract	Population	Non-Hispanic White	Minority	Percent Minority	Hispanic Origin	Percent Hispanic Origin
06065042903	3,929	1,168	2,761	70.3	2,002	51.0
06065042714	2,979	2,608	371	12.5	204	6.8
06065042713	4,231	2,867	1,364	32.2	1,116	26.4
06065042902	3,829	1,489	2,340	61.1	1,765	46.1
06065042716	4,754	4,036	718	15.1	523	11.0
06065042717	2,790	1,743	1,047	37.5	902	32.3
06065042901	5,289	1,712	3,577	67.6	2,726	51.5
06065042709	3,749	2,999	750	20.0	564	15.0
06065042708	4,413	3,122	1,291	29.3	1,001	22.7
06065042711	4,860	4,284	576	11.9	346	7.1
06065042710	3,913	3,625	288	7.4	140	3.6
06065042718	5,072	2,708	2,364	46.6	2,094	41.3
06065042800	6,451	1,114	5,337	82.7	3,917	60.7
06065042603	14,563	3,047	11,516	79.1	8,578	58.9
06065042706	6,032	1,095	4,937	81.8	3,316	55.0
06065042602	4,220	1,562	2,658	63.0	1,756	41.6
06065042712	7,539	5,679	1,860	24.7	1,303	17.3
06065042722	8,339	5,918	2,421	29.0	1,849	22.2
06065042719	3,641	2,037	1,604	44.1	1,246	34.2
06065042720	2,996	1,980	1,016	33.9	897	29.9
06065042723	4,347	3,044	1,303	30.0	1,137	26.2
06065042721	4,751	3,063	1,688	35.5	1,496	31.5
06065043305	5,642	4,688	954	16.9	599	10.6
Total	118,329	65,588	52,741	44.6	39,477	33.4

Source: 2000 Census.

8.10.1.2.2 Low Income Populations

Table 8.10-5 presents the data regarding the percent of the population that has income below the poverty level for the 23 census tracts located within 6 miles of the SVEP. The census tract with the highest level of poverty among this group is Tract 06065042800, at 35.5 percent. This tract has 6,336 residents and is located in the City of Perris, approximately 3.75 miles northwest of the SVEP. Four of the tracts have poverty populations above 20 percent and less than 30 percent.

TABLE 8.10-5
Distribution of Low Income Population by Census Tracts Within a 6-Mile Radius

Tract	Total Population*	Population below Poverty Level	Percent Low Income
06065042903	3,918	874	22.3
06065042714	3,087	117	3.8
06065042713	4,222	196	4.6
06065042902	3,795	970	25.6
06065042716	4,745	312	6.6
06065042717	2,879	388	13.5
06065042901	5,245	1,003	19.1
06065042709	3,557	309	8.7
06065042708	4,370	442	10.1
06065042711	4,860	461	9.5
06065042710	3,913	237	6.1
06065042718	4,997	883	17.7
06065042800	6,336	2,248	35.5
06065042603	14,285	2,555	17.9
06065042706	6,012	807	13.4
06065042602	4,086	698	17.1
06065042712	7,378	409	5.5
06065042722	8,215	688	8.4
06065042719	3,610	566	15.7
06065042720	2,950	520	17.6
06065042723	4,333	991	22.9
06065042721	4,708	729	15.5
06065043305	5,494	380	6.9
Total	116,995	16,783	14.3

Source: 2000 Census.

* Population numbers are only those for whom poverty was determined and exclude full-time college students.

8.10.1.3 Housing

As shown in Table 8.10-6, housing stock for the Riverside County as of January 1, 2005, was 690,075 units. Single-family dwellings (both attached and unattached units) accounted for 49,488 units, multiple family dwellings accounted for 115,058 units, and mobile homes accounted for 83,529 units. New housing authorizations for Riverside County in 2003 totaled 30,361 units and about 83 percent were single-family units and 17 percent were multi-family units. These authorizations were valued at \$5,179.02 million (DOF, 2005b). Riverside County's vacancy rate is approximately 13.3 percent, above the federal standard of 5 percent, which indicates that housing availability within the County is relatively high. The median sales price of homes in Riverside County was \$354,740 in 2002, having increased from \$119,259 in 1982 (DOF, 2002).

Table 8.10-6 shows the housing stock for the cities and communities in Riverside County that are close to the project (as of January 1, 2005), as well as that for the county and the State of California.

TABLE 8.10-6
Housing Estimates by City and County, January 1, 2005

Area	Total Units	Single Family	Multi-family	Mobile Homes	Percent Vacant
Perris	12,673	9,298	1,635	1,740	8.5
Riverside	93,451	62,812	28,208	2,431	4.6
Romoland CDP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sun City CDP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Riverside County	690,075	491,488	115,058	83,529	13.3
California	12,945,237	8,345,494	4,018,486	581,257	5.9

Source: DOF (2005c).

8.10.1.4 Economy and Employment

Between 1998 and 2004, employment in Riverside County increased by about 264,700 jobs or 29 percent, which is much higher than California's employment growth for the same period of about 7 percent. As shown in Table 8.10-7, employment grew in most industries, including construction and services, and decreased in agriculture and natural resources/mining. Between 1998 and 2004, employment in the construction sector increased by 49,800 jobs or by about 82 percent. The construction sector has had the highest average annual growth rate (10.5 percent) over the last 6 years compared to all the other sectors. The Professional and Business Services sector had the second highest average annual growth rate (7.4 percent) during the same period.

Table 8.10-8 provides 2004 annual average employment data for Riverside County, the cities of Perris and Riverside, and the communities of Romoland and Sun City, compared to California as a whole. The Riverside County average of 5.8 percent is only slightly higher than the State average. California Employment Development Department (CEDD) does not project future unemployment rates.

TABLE 8.10-7
Employment Distribution of Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA 1998-2004

Industry	1998		2004		1998-2004	
	Number of Employees	Employment Share (%)	Number of Employees	Employment Share (%)	Percentage Change (%)	Average Annual Growth (%)
Agriculture	21,600	2.4	18,800	1.6	-13.0	-2.3
Natural Resources/ Mining	1,400	0.2	1,200	0.1	-14.3	-2.5
Construction	61,000	6.7	110,800	9.5	81.6	10.5
Manufacturing	109,100	12.1	120,000	10.3	10.0	1.6
Wholesale Trade	33,100	3.7	44,400	3.8	34.1	5.0
Retail Trade	116,100	12.8	151,800	13.0	30.7	4.6
Transportation, Warehousing, Utilities	42,000	4.6	54,300	4.6	29.3	4.4
Information	12,400	1.4	13,800	1.2	11.3	1.8
Financial Activities	33,000	3.7	45,300	3.9	37.3	5.4
Professional and Business Services	81,700	9.0	125,200	10.7	53.2	7.4
Education and Health Services	96,400	10.7	117,700	10.1	22.1	3.4
Leisure and Hospitality	90,700	10.0	115,200	9.9	27.0	4.1
Other Services	30,800	3.4	38,800	3.3	26.0	3.9
Government	174,700	19.3	211,500	18.1	21.1	3.2
Industry Total	903,800	100.0	1,168,500	100.0	29.3	4.4

Source: California Employment Development Department (CEDD) (2005a).

TABLE 8.10-8
Employment Data 2004

City	Civilian Labor Force	Employed Labor Force	Unemployed Labor Force	Unemployment Rate
Perris	16,600	15,100	1,500	9.0%
Riverside	144,100	135,300	8,800	6.1%
Romoland CDP	1,300	1,200	100	9.2%
Sun City CDP	5,600	5,200	400	6.7%
Riverside County	810,600	763,800	46,800	5.8%
California	17,552,300	16,459,900	1,092,400	6.2%

Source: CEDD (2005b).

8.10.1.5 Fiscal Resources

Riverside County is the local agency with taxing power. Riverside County's expenditures and revenues are presented in Table 8.10-9. The County's General Fund has shown steady growth from year-to-year. From fiscal year (FY) 2002 to FY 2003, General Fund revenues grew 2.5 percent, a growth almost the same (2.6 percent) as that over the next year (from FY 2003 to FY 2004). Revenue from taxes comprises between 19 and 22 percent of the County's total General Fund revenue.

TABLE 8.10-9
Riverside County Revenues and Expenditures by Function and Fund (\$ Million)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	Projected FY 2006*
Expenditures:			
General Government	193.81	231.50	312.06
Public Protection	710.06	806.09	845.45
Public Ways & Facilities	119.35	164.06	260.37
Health Sanitation	351.20	379.85	395.21
Public Assistance	580.52	630.04	704.88
Education	10.16	11.41	12.59
Recreation & Cultural Services	0.20	0.21	0.20
Debt Service	24.94	53.65	55.68
Other	8.33	7.50	0.00
Total Expenditures	1,998.57	2,284.31	2,586.43
Revenue:			
Taxes	238.83	260.01	279.96
Sales & Use	26.63	29.30	30.80
Property	176.91	191.59	210.11
Other	35.29	39.11	39.05
Licenses, Permits, and Franchises	26.04	25.51	24.58
Fines, Forfeitures, and Penalties	43.30	47.62	46.42
Use of Assets—Interest	12.68	20.33	26.02
Intergovernmental Revenues:	1,044.88	1,154.99	1,275.46
Intergovernmental Revenues—Federal	618.29	710.10	770.43
Intergovernmental Revenues—State	426.59	444.89	505.03
Charges for Services	428.04	461.83	537.98
Miscellaneous Revenue	158.46	206.12	211.29
Other Financing Sources	96.12	112.78	107.51
Use of Assets—Rents and Concessions	7.16	7.91	28.85
Total Revenue	2,058.65	2,300.12	2,541.02

Source: Riverside County, 2005.

* Not yet adopted.

8.10.1.6 Education

There are 23 school districts in Riverside County. The Romoland Elementary School District and Perris Union High School District (PUHSD) serve the SVEP site area. Historical, current, and projected enrollment figures for the four school districts are presented in Table 8.10-10.

TABLE 8.10-10
Historical, Current, and Projected Enrollment by Grade

Total Romoland Elementary School District and Perris Union High School District		
Grade Level	Enrollment (2003-04)	Enrollment (2004-05)
Kindergarten	177	182
First	178	203
Second	192	196
Third	206	218
Fourth	202	221
Fifth	219	226
Sixth	231	228
Seventh	926	997
Eighth	916	979
Ninth	1,701	1,847
Tenth	1,592	1,685
Eleventh	1,393	1,593
Twelfth	1,328	1,364
Ungraded secondary	0	3
Total	65,380	64,329

Source: California Department of Education (CDE), 2005.

The Romoland School District maintains three schools in the community of Romoland. Romoland Elementary School is located at 25890 Antelope, Harvest Valley Elementary School is located at 29955 Watson Road, and the newly opened Boulder Ridge Elementary School is located on Junipero Road. These three schools are elementary education facilities, serving kindergarten through eighth grade. During the 2004-2005 school year, attendance at the Romoland and Harvest Valley Elementary schools totaled 1,902 students (California Department of Education [CDE], 2005) (Boulder Ridge Elementary School was not open in 2004-2005.)

The PUHSD maintains six facilities in Perris Valley. Total enrollment within the district is approximately 8,040 students (CDE, 2005). Children attending either of the two elementary education facilities within the Romoland Elementary School District would attend Perris High School. Perris High is located at 175 East Nuevo Road in the City of Perris.

8.10.1.7 Public Services and Facilities

8.10.1.7.1 Law Enforcement

Police services in most parts of Riverside County are provided by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The Riverside County Sheriff's station serving the Sun Valley area is the Perris substation located at 403 E. 4th Street in the City of Perris. Average response time to calls in the vicinity of the Sun Valley site is estimated at no longer than 5 minutes for emergency calls and no more than 15 minutes for non-emergency calls (McElvain, 2005).

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) is the primary law enforcement agency for state highways and roads. Services include law enforcement, traffic control, accident investigation, and the management of hazardous materials spill incidents.

8.10.1.7.2 Fire Protection

The Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) serves the project area. The RCFD is one of the largest regional fire service organizations in California. The RCFD responded to 96,524 incidents during the 2002 calendar year. The RCFD is staffed with approximately 865 career and 900 volunteer personnel, and currently serves approximately 1,545,000 residents in an area of 7,004 square miles. This service area consists of the unincorporated county areas, 16 contract cities, and one Community Service District (CSD).

The nearest fire station to SVEP is Riverside County Station No. 54, located at 25730 Sultan Road in Homeland, approximately 2.7 miles from the project site. Station No. 54 is staffed on a 24-hour basis. The average response time to calls is 5 minutes throughout the service area. The response time to the project site is currently estimated at 5 minutes.

8.10.1.7.3 Emergency Response

In accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 533.4, the Office of Emergency Services maintains two fully functional Emergency Operations Centers (EOC). The EOCs are the center of countywide coordination for the response and recovery to extraordinary emergencies and disasters affecting the County of Riverside. The EOCs provide response services to hazardous materials incidents throughout Riverside County. The County has two EOCs, one serving the western part of the county and the other serving the eastern part of the county. The EOC serving the western part is the Primary EOC based in the City of Riverside. The EOC serving the eastern part is based in Indio. The project site would be handled by the Primary EOC. Each team has two vehicles and one person per vehicle. After hours, the staff participates in the 911 dispatch system. The estimated response time to an emergency from the project site would be 20 minutes, depending on traffic.

8.10.1.7.4 Hospitals

Emergency medical services are provided by the County Sheriff, fire units, and local ambulance services. There are a number of emergency hospitals in the Riverside area that can provide most types of routine and emergency medical treatment, including intensive care. The nearest emergency medical facility to SVEP is the Menifee Valley Medical Center, located at 28400 McCall Boulevard in Sun City. This is a full-service acute care facility with about 84 beds and a full service emergency department that serves nearly 54,000 visits annually. The hospital also has intensive care units, rehabilitation programs, cancer services and an open heart surgery program. The next nearest hospital to SVEP is the Perris

Community Hospital, previously known as Valley Plaza Doctors Hospital, located at 2224 Medical Center Drive in Perris. This hospital has 28 sub-acute care beds, 6 intensive care beds, and two operating rooms.

8.10.1.8 Utilities

8.10.1.8.1 Electricity and Gas

SVEP will connect to Southern California Edison's (SCE) electrical transmission system at the Valley Substation. This may require a single transmission tower to be located north of the site on the SCE property. The project will construct a natural gas pipeline approximately 750 feet to the Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas) main line in Menifee Road to the east.

8.10.1.8.2 Water

Reclaimed water is available adjacent to the site. The project will connect with a brine line in McLaughlin Road approximately 0.75 mile northwest of the project. Potable water is available adjacent to the site.

The Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) supplies water in and around the communities surrounding the proposed project; the Sun Valley site is included in this service area. The Urban Water Management Plan (EMWD, 2000) describes the water system analysis, identifies improvements to correct existing deficiencies and serve future growth, and presents the estimated costs and phasing of the recommended improvements.

8.10.1.8.3 Sewer

Wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal services in the Sun Valley area are provided by the EMWD. Sewage is collected locally and transported by sewers to one of the five Regional Water Reclamation Facilities (RWRF) within its service area. The RWRFs provide tertiary sewage treatment through a pure oxygen activated sludge process and chemical disinfection. The treated effluent is stored on site before much of it is sold for municipal, agricultural, or public use (EMWD, 2001).

The primary wastewater collection system will collect process wastewater from all of the plant equipment and a secondary system will collect sanitary waste water from sinks, toilets, showers, and other sanitary facilities. The resulting waste will be disposed of offsite in accordance with federal, state and local requirements.

8.10.2 Environmental Consequences

Potential project impacts were determined by comparing project demands during construction and operation with the socioeconomic resources of the project area (i.e., Riverside County). A power generating facility could impact employment, population, housing, public services and utilities, and/or schools. Impacts could be local and/or regional, though most impacts would tend to be more regional than local. It is anticipated that the project will not have any significant adverse impacts on the socioeconomic environment, but it will have socioeconomic benefits to the local community.

8.10.2.1 Significance Criteria

The criteria used to determine the significance of project-related socioeconomic impacts are as suggested in Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Project-related impacts are determined to be significant if they:

- Induce substantial growth or concentration of population
- Displace a large number of people or existing housing
- Result in substantial adverse environmental impacts associated with the provision of utility services
- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public services

Other impacts may be significant if they cause substantial change in community interaction patterns, social organization, social structures, or social institutions; substantial conflict with community attitudes, values, or perceptions; or substantial inequities in the distribution of project cost and benefit.

8.10.2.2 Construction Impacts

Construction will take place over approximately 12 months, from spring 2007 to spring 2008. Commercial operation is expected to commence in August 2008. Personnel requirements will be minimal during the mobilization and site grading period (i.e., during the first 3 months of the construction period) and during the startup and testing period (i.e., during the last 3 months of the construction period).

8.10.2.2.1 Construction Workforce

The trades in most demand for SVEP construction will include boilermakers, carpenters, electricians, ironworkers, laborers, millwrights, operators, and pipefitters. Table 8.10-11 provides an estimate of construction personnel requirements for the plant. Total construction personnel requirements for the plant will be an average of 220 workers per month for 12 months with a peak work force of 408 per month during the eighth month. The project's capital cost is estimated at \$230 (\$220 to \$250) million. The construction payroll is estimated at \$28.6 million (in 2005 dollars).

TABLE 8.10-11
Construction Personnel by Month

Discipline	Months After Notice-to-Proceed												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Insulation Workers			11	18	32	21	21	21	21	43	11	7	208
Bricklayers/Masons		4	11	11	7	7	7	7	7	7	4	4	75
Carpenters		11	18	21	18	21	25	29	25	14	7	7	197
Electricians		7	9	11	14	25	47	57	63	66	73	29	401
Ironworkers		7	54	50	54	54	50	43	39	32	29	14	426

TABLE 8.10-11
Construction Personnel by Month

Discipline	Months After Notice-to-Proceed												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Laborers	5	7	20	27	54	54	54	54	27	13	7	7	328
Millwrights			23	34	47	72	72	72	50	14	14	2	399
Operating Engineers	5	11	11	11	21	21	18	14	7	2	2	2	125
Painters					7	14	14	14	7	7	4	4	72
Pipefitters			5	11	14	14	30	72	21	11	7	4	190
Sheetmetal Workers					5	11	14	16	14	14	14	4	93
Surveyors	7	7	4	4									21
Teamsters	4	7	11	18	11	11	9	9	9	5	4	2	98
Total Workforce	21	61	175	215	285	326	362	408	292	229	175	84	2,633

Available skilled labor in the Riverside County was evaluated by reviewing information obtained from the Building and Construction Trades Council contact indicated in Table 8.10-12 and information provided by the CEDD and presented in Table 8.10-13. As shown in Table 8.10-13, the workforce in Riverside County will be adequate to fulfill SVEP's labor requirements for construction. Therefore, SVEP construction will not place an undue burden on the local workforce. In addition, as shown previously in Table 8.10-7, the mining and construction workforce within the County has been growing at an average annual rate of 10.5 percent per year. Thus, SVEP is not likely to result in a significant impact on the available workforce of skilled construction workers.

TABLE 8.10-12
Labor Union Contacts

Labor Union	Contact	Phone Number
Riverside-San Bernardino County Building and Construction Trades Council	Phil Eckert	951-684-1040

TABLE 8.10-13
Available Labor by Skill in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, 2002 to 2012

Occupational Title	Annual Averages		Absolute Change	Percentage Change	Average Annual Compounded Growth Rate (%)
	2002	2012			
Carpenters	15,170	22,120	6,950	45.8	3.8
Cement masons and concrete finishers	3,950	6,030	2,080	52.7	4.3
Painters, construction and maintenance	2,880	4,260	1,380	47.9	4.0
Sheet metal workers	2,980	3,930	950	31.9	2.8

TABLE 8.10-13
Available Labor by Skill in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, 2002 to 2012

Occupational Title	Annual Averages		Absolute Change	Percentage Change	Average Annual Compounded Growth Rate (%)
	2002	2012			
Electricians	5,170	6,980	1,810	35.0	3.0
Welders, cutters, solderers, and brazers	3,200	4,210	1,010	31.6	2.8
Industrial truck & tractor operators	8,170	11,550	3,380	41.4	3.5
Operating engineers	4,330	5,450	1,120	25.9	2.3
Helpers, laborers	4,080	5,610	1,530	37.5	3.2
Plumbers, pipefitters, and steamfitters	12,720	17,980	5,260	41.4	3.5
Administrative services managers	4,320	5,600	1,280	29.6	2.6
Mechanical engineers	1,740	2,280	540	31.0	2.7
Electrical engineers	940	1,100	160	17.0	1.6
Engineering technicians	350	380	30	8.6	0.8
Plant and system operators	2,580	3,600	1,020	39.5	3.4

Source: CEDD, 2005c.

Although a similar project, the Inland Empire Energy Center (IEEC), is located near the SVEP and will require the same kind of workforce as the SVEP, there will be no conflict between labor demands for the two projects. This is because the IEEC began construction in August of 2005 and will be entering the final stage of construction, with reduced workforce demands, in Spring of 2007, when SVEP construction begins. The IEEC is scheduled for completion in September of 2007, and construction workforce for IEEC will diminish from 237 in May 2007 to 58 in September 2007, at same time that the SVEP is increasing workforce from 12 in its first month of construction during the spring of 2007, to 159 in the fifth month of construction (IEEC, LLC, 2005). Given the relatively small workforce requirement that SVEP has relative to the IEEC, there should be no shortage of labor.

8.10.2.2.2 Population Impacts

It is anticipated that the workforce to construct the project is available in the local or regional area. For this evaluation, it is assumed that most of the work force will be drawn from Riverside County and will commute daily to the project area during the construction period. The project is also within commuting distance of Orange, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Bernardino Counties. Because most of the construction work force (a peak of 228 workers during the eighth month and an average of 220 workers per month over the 12 month duration of the construction) will commute to the project, rather than relocate, impacts to Riverside County and local school districts are expected to be minimal. The number of construction workers required by the plant will not make a significant impact on the population of the County or significantly increase the non-resident commuter worker population of the Riverside County.

8.10.2.2.3 Housing Impacts

Most of the construction workforce will likely commute to the project site daily. As shown in Table 8.10-6, there are a total of 690,075 housing units in Riverside County, of which 91,780² are vacant. Because housing supply is not limited within the County and neighboring cities of Perris and Riverside, workers wishing to relocate would have plenty of housing to choose from. For those workers not interested in permanent housing or who are interested in accommodations during the workweek, there are 242 hotels/motels with 22,317 rooms in Riverside County. In the year ending July 2005, the average hotel/motel vacancy rate in Riverside County was about 36.4 percent while the average room rate was \$101 (Strong, 2005). In addition to the available hotel/motel accommodation, there are about 4 recreational vehicle parks within 10 miles and 10 recreational vehicle parks within 25 miles of the SVEP. As a result, construction of the proposed project is not expected to increase the demand for housing.

8.10.2.2.4 Impacts to the Local Economy and Employment

The cost of materials and supplies required by the project is estimated at \$180 million. The estimated value of materials and supplies that will be purchased locally in Riverside County during construction is \$6 to \$9 million.

SVEP will provide about \$28.6 million (2005 dollars) in construction payroll, at an average salary of \$65 per hour (including benefits). The anticipated payroll for employees, as well as the purchase of materials and supplies during the construction period, will have a beneficial impact on the area's economy. Assuming, conservatively, that 60 percent of the construction workforce will reside in Riverside County, it is expected that approximately \$17.16 million will stay in the local area. These additional funds will cause a temporary beneficial impact by creating the potential for other employment opportunities for local workers in other service areas, such as transportation and retail.

Construction activity would result in secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts) within Riverside County. Secondary employment effects would include indirect and induced employment due to the purchase of goods and services by firms involved with construction, and induced employment due to construction workers spending their income within the county. In addition to these secondary employment impacts, there are indirect and induced income effects arising from construction. The project would create a temporary positive impact on the local economic base and fiscal resources. Employment for local and regional workers would provide additional area income as would local expenditures for construction materials and services. Increased local incomes and sales would also generate tax revenues for the local and regional areas.

Indirect and induced impacts were estimated using the IMPLAN economic input-output model of Riverside County. IMPLAN is an economic modeling software program. Based on the IMPLAN calculations, the estimated indirect and induced employment within Riverside County would be 158 and 155 jobs, respectively. These additional jobs result from the \$9 million in annual local construction expenditures as well as the \$12.012 million in spending by local construction workers. The \$12.012 million represents the disposable portion of the annual construction payroll (here assumed to be 70% of \$17.16 million). Assuming an average

² 690,075 total housing units multiplied by 13.3 percent vacancy rate for the county.

direct construction employment of 220, the employment multiplier associated with the construction phase of the project is approximately 2.4 (i.e., $[220 + 158 + 155]/220$). This project construction phase employment multiplier is based on a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) type model. The Type SAM multiplier equals the sum of the multipliers for the direct, indirect, and induced effects. Direct effects capture the impact of direct expenditures. Indirect effects capture the impact of purchases among industries while induced effects capture the impact of household expenditures induced by changes in labor income.

Indirect and induced income impacts were estimated at \$4,938,640 and \$4,413,910, respectively. Assuming a total annual local construction expenditure (payroll, materials and supplies) of \$26.16 million (\$17.16 million in payroll + \$9 million in materials and supplies), the project construction phase income multiplier based on a Type SAM model is approximately 1.4 (i.e., $[\$26,160,000 + \$4,938,640 + \$4,413,910]/\$26,160,000$).

If annual local construction expenditures were \$6 million, instead of \$9 million, the indirect and induced employment within Riverside County would be 106 and 143 jobs, respectively. Based on the same average direct construction employment of 220, the construction phase employment multiplier is approximately 2.1.

Indirect and induced income impacts based on the total annual construction expenditure of \$23.16 million (\$17.16 million in payroll + \$6 million in materials and supplies) were estimated at \$3,321,810 and \$4,080,390, respectively. Based on these estimates, the construction phase income multiplier was estimated at 1.3.

8.10.2.2.5 Fiscal Impacts

SVEP initial capital cost is estimated to be \$230 (\$220 to \$280) million; of this, materials and supplies are estimated at approximately \$180 million. The estimated value of materials and supplies that will be purchased locally (within Riverside County) during construction is between \$6 and \$9 million.

The effect on fiscal resources during construction will be from sales taxes realized on equipment and materials purchased in the County and use taxes on equipment purchased out of state. The sales and use tax rate in Riverside County is 7.75 percent (as of October 1, 2005). Of this, 6.0 percent goes to the state; 0.25 percent goes to the County; one percent goes to the place of sale; and 0.5 percent goes to the special districts (BOE, 2005). The total local sales and use tax expected to be generated during construction is \$14.0million.

8.10.2.2.6 Impacts on Education

The schools in the project area are currently not considered overcrowded, and Romoland School District has recently constructed the Boulder Ridge Elementary School to accommodate new residential growth. Construction of SVEP will not cause significant population changes or housing impacts to the region. Most employees will commute to the site from areas within the County, as opposed to relocating to the area. As a result, SVEP construction will not cause any significant increase in demand for school services.

8.10.2.2.7 Impacts on Public Services and Facilities

Current police, fire, and medical facilities should be sufficient to handle the demands of the Project. The site's perimeter fence will assist local law enforcement agencies with area security. Onsite fire protection systems will meet all National Fire Protection Association

(NFPA), Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA), state, and local requirements. Communication equipment will be available onsite at all times to contact emergency response agencies

8.10.2.2.8 Impacts on Utilities

SVEP construction will not make significant adverse demands on local water, sanitary sewer, electricity, or natural gas. Impacts will involve the extension of existing utility lines. Water requirements for construction are relatively insignificant. Given the number of workers and temporary duration of the construction period, the impacts on the local sanitary sewer system would not be significant.

Sanitary wastes will be collected in portable self-contained toilets and returned to the sanitary sewer through existing sewer lines located adjacent to the project site. Solid wastes generated during construction would be collected onsite and disposed of regularly at the El Sobrante Landfill in Corona.

8.10.2.3 Operational Impacts

8.10.2.3.1 Operational Workforce

The proposed SVEP facility is expected to begin commercial operation in 2008. It is expected to employ up to 9 full-time employees. Anticipated job classifications are shown in Table 8.10-14. The entire permanent workforce is expected to commute from within Riverside County.

TABLE 8.10-14
Typical Plant Operation Workforce

Department	Personnel	Shift	Workdays
Operations	8 operating technicians	Four rotating 8-hour shifts, 2 operators per shift	7 days per week
Maintenance	1 maintenance technician	Standard 8-hour days	5 days per week (Maintenance technicians will also work unscheduled days and hours as required)

8.10.2.3.2 Population Impacts

Facility employees will be drawn from the regional workforce and from the local area. There will be no significant impact on local employment because only 9 additional staff will be required for plant operations. Because there is a large skilled labor pool in the greater Riverside County area available for operation of the project, the project will not result in an influx of operation workers to relocate in the local area.

8.10.2.3.3 Housing Impacts

Due to the few operations staff, significant impacts to housing are not anticipated. The project will not displace current residents. The work force is assumed available in the local area (Riverside and surrounding counties). It assumed that few if any operations staff would relocate to the project area and, therefore, impacts to housing would be minimal.

8.10.2.3.4 Impacts to the Local Economy and Employment

SVEP operation will generate a small, permanent beneficial impact by creating employment opportunities for local workers through local expenditures for materials, such as office supplies and services. The average salary per operations employee is expected to be \$70,000 per year. For the assumed average of 9 full-time employees, this will result in an operation payroll of \$630,000 per year. There will be an annual operations budget of approximately \$3 million, most of which is estimated to be spent locally, (i.e., within Riverside County). In addition, there will be an annual maintenance budget of approximately \$4 million. These additional jobs and spending will generate other employment opportunities and spending in Riverside County.

The operation of the proposed project would result in indirect and induced economic impacts that would occur within Riverside County depending on the point of sale. These indirect and induced impacts represent permanent increases in the county's economic variables. The indirect and induced impacts would result from annual expenditures on payroll as well as those on operations and maintenance (O&M).

Estimated indirect and induced employment within Riverside County would be 31 and 13 permanent jobs, respectively. These additional 44 jobs result from the \$7.5 million (\$630,000 in payroll, \$4 million in maintenance and \$3 million in operations) in annual operational budget. The operational phase employment multiplier is estimated at 5.8 (i.e., $[9 + 31 + 13]/9$) and is based on a Type SAM multiplier.

Indirect and induced income impacts are estimated at \$1,173,230 and \$365,880, respectively. The income multiplier associated with the operational phase of the project is approximately 1.2 (i.e., $[\$7,630,000 + \$1,173,230 + \$365,880]/\$7,630,000$) and is based on a Type SAM model.

8.10.2.3.5 Fiscal Impacts

The annual operations budget is expected to be approximately \$3 million, all of which, it is assumed, would be spent locally within Riverside County. In addition, there will be an annual maintenance budget of approximately \$4 million. As stated in the impacts to the economy section, SVEP will bring \$630,000 in operational payroll to the region.

During operations, additional sales tax revenues will be obtained by Riverside County. Increased payroll will be \$630,000 annually, and additional O&M expenses will be approximately \$7 million annually. Assuming local expenditures of \$3 million annually, the estimated sales taxes will be approximately \$232,500. Of this amount, the place of sale will receive \$30,000 in sales tax revenue. The overall anticipated increase in sales tax revenue will be beneficial but not significant because it would constitute such a small percent of total county revenues.

8.10.2.3.6 Impacts on Education

The schools in the Romoland and Perris Unified school districts are currently not considered overcrowded. Even assuming that most of the nine operational employees would relocate to Romoland from elsewhere, SVEP operation is not expected to create any significant adverse impacts to the local school system. Assuming an average of three persons per household for Riverside County (DOF, 2005a) would imply the addition of approximately nine children to the local schools. This would constitute less than one-fifth of one percent increase in school

enrollment. The project would be located within the Romoland Elementary and the PUHSD. The two school districts assess school impact fees on any development and share in the fees collected (Mendosa, 2005). Thus, the project would be expected to pay school impact fees.

8.10.2.3.7 Impacts on Public Services and Facilities

Project operation will not make significant demands on public services or facilities. Existing Sheriff and Fire Department facilities are adequate to provide services to the project. SVEP operation would not create significant adverse impacts on medical resources in the area because of the safety record of power plants and small operations staff.

Plant operations should not result in significant adverse impacts to local public services, facilities, or emergency services.

8.10.2.3.8 Impacts on Utilities

SVEP operation will not make significant adverse demands on local water, sanitary sewer, electricity, or natural gas because adequate supply and capacity currently exist.

8.10.2.4 Environmental Justice

8.10.2.4.1 Evaluation of Disproportionate Impacts

President Clinton's Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations" was signed on February 11, 1994. The purpose of this Executive Order is to identify and address whether adverse human health or environmental effects are likely to fall disproportionately on minority and/or low-income members of the community. The Order requires that impacts on minority or low-income populations be taken into account when preparing environmental and socioeconomic analyses of projects or programs that are proposed, funded, or licensed by federal agencies.

In April 1998, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) published its *Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analysis*. This document provides specific guidelines for determining whether there could be environmental justice impacts associated with a proposed federal project that undertakes analysis of environmental regulatory issues under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The California Energy Commission (CEC) has incorporated an environmental justice analysis as part of its power plant licensing process under CEQA. The federal government views environmental justice as a civil rights standard and a way of preventing racial and economic discrimination, rather than as a remedy for disproportionate impacts that may already exist. To prove violation of civil rights, the government must show that a project would cause impacts that are "disproportionately high and adverse," either directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. In other words, the following must apply: (1) the project would cause a significant (high) adverse impact, (2) minority and/or low income populations must be present within the project area, and (3) the impacts must disproportionately affect the minority or low-income populations, compared with other populations. For power plant permitting, air quality impacts are generally considered most likely to raise issues of racial and economic discrimination.

In general, construction of a new power plant results in a net reduction of regional air emissions because CEC and regional air management district permits require that emission reduction credits be obtained. The fact that the regulatory agencies have set very clear standards for power plant emissions in terms of human health risk assessment may mean that discriminatory project siting can only be viewed cumulatively. If a specific project does not have a significant impact on human health, it can only have a significant and discriminatory impact on a minority or low income population in conjunction with and in addition to, other impacts that population is experiencing, some of which may not be caused by air emissions.

According to USEPA guidelines, the first step in conducting an environmental justice analysis is to define minority and low-income populations. Based on the USEPA guidelines, a minority population is present in a project area if the following conditions apply: (1) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent, or (2) the minority population percentage in the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population. These guidelines do not provide a numeric measure for low-income populations; rather, they advise that the analyst use the techniques that best suit the project at hand. The guidance suggests using two or three standard deviations above the mean as a quantitative measure of disproportionate effects. The area of potential effect for the purpose of an environmental justice screening is an approximately 6-mile radius surrounding the project site. The CEC has used this distance in past projects to assess potential air emissions effects.

8.10.2.4.2 SVEP Project

Environmental justice impacts are unlikely to occur as a result of construction or operation of the SVEP because the project would cause no significant, unmitigated adverse impacts (high and adverse impacts). All of the project's impacts would be mitigated to a level below significance. Therefore, although 7 of the 23 census tracts within 6 miles of the project site contain minority populations greater than 50 percent, the project's impacts would not be significant, so could not be significant and disproportionate. The area within 6 miles of the project does not contain any census tracts in which more than 50 percent of the population is low income.

8.10.3 Cumulative Impacts

Because both construction and operations personnel will reside primarily in Riverside County and live within commuting distance no adverse impact to local schools or housing is anticipated. Although there may be a temporary increase in demand for construction workers, the available supply of workers in the region is more than adequate, so no adverse cumulative impacts are expected and similarly there are no cumulative impacts of operating the power plant. Additionally, the relocation of labor personnel is not necessary. Employees from the existing local labor pool will operate the plant. The local economy will be enhanced by the multiplier effect of SVEP workers spending local payroll in the area and local purchases of equipment and materials. Operation of the plant will provide public benefits including reliable electricity to the participating municipalities.

Consequently, no adverse cumulative socioeconomic impacts are anticipated from either the construction or operation of SVEP. Instead, the local community will enjoy a beneficial (but not significant) impact from short-term construction and longer-term operations employment.

8.10.4 Mitigation Measures

No significant socioeconomic impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

8.10.5 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

A summary of the LORS, including the project's conformance to them, is presented in Table 8.10-15.

8.10.5.1 Federal

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, 78 Stat. 241 (codified as amended in various sections of 42 U.S. Code [USC]), Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin by all federal agencies or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," requires federal agencies to consider whether the project may result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any minority or low-income population. Although CEC is not obligated as a matter of law to conduct an environmental justice analysis, since the signing of the executive order, the CEC has typically included this topic in its power plant siting decisions to ensure that any potential adverse impacts are identified and addressed.

TABLE 8.10-15
Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards Applicable to SVEP Socioeconomics

LORS	Purpose	Applicability	Conformance
Federal			
Civil Rights Act of 1964	Prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.	Applies to all federal agencies and agencies receiving federal funds.	Section 8.10.2
Executive Order 12898	Avoid disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority and low-income members of the community.	Applies only to federal agencies.	Section 8.10.2
State			
Government Code Sections 65996-65997	Establishes that the levy of a fee for constructing an industrial facility be considered as mitigating impacts on school facilities.	Romoland Elementary School District and PUHSD may charge a one-time assessment fee to mitigate potential school impacts.	Section 8.10.2
Education Code Section 17620	Allows a school district to levy a fee against any construction within the boundaries of the district for the purpose of funding construction of school facilities.	Romoland Elementary School District and PUHSD may charge a one-time assessment fee to mitigate potential school impacts.	Section 8.10.2
Local			
None identified			

8.10.5.2 State

Government Code Sections 65996 and 65997 provide the exclusive methods of considering and mitigating impacts on school facilities that might occur as a result of developing real property. As amended by Senate Bill (SB) 50 (Stats. 1998, ch. 407, sec.23), these sections state that public agencies may not impose fees, charges, or other financial requirements to offset the cost for school facilities.

Education Code Section 17620, listed in Government Code Section 65997 as an approved mitigation method, allows school districts to levy a fee or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the school district for the purpose of funding construction of school facilities.

8.10.5.3 Local

No local LORS have been identified with regard to the social and economic effects of development. The proposed project site is in unincorporated part of Riverside County.

8.10.6 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

Table 8.10-16 lists agencies and contact persons of potentially responsible agencies.

TABLE 8.10-16
Agencies and Agency Contacts for SVEP Socioeconomics

Agency	Contact/Title	Phone Number	Address
Romoland Elementary School District	Yvonne Mendosa, Facility Manager	(951) 926-9244	3939 13th Street Riverside, CA 92502
Riverside County Sheriff's Department Perris Station	James McElvain, Administrative Lieutenant	(951) 940-6200	403 E. 4th Perris, CA 92570
Riverside County Fire Department	Captain Raga, Riverside County Fire Department, Station 118	(626) 336-6950	210 W. San Jacinto Perris, CA 92570

8.10.7 Permits and Permitting Schedule

No applicable permits related to socioeconomic impacts of the project are required. Permits dealing with the effects on public services are addressed as part of the building permit process. For example school impact taxes and development fees are typically collected when the Applicant pays in-lieu building permit fees to the County.

8.10.8 References

[California] Board of Equalization (BOE). 2005. California City and County Sales and Use Tax Rates *Publication 71*. Internet site: <http://www.boe.ca.gov/pdf/pub71.pdf>.

[California] Department of Finance (DOF). 2005a. Demographic Information. Reports and Research Papers. Estimates and Projections. Internet sites:
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/repndat.asp>
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/HistE-4.htm>
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5text2.htm>

[California] Department of Finance (DOF). 2005b. Financial and Economic data. California Statistical Abstract, released December 2004 – Construction, *Table I-5 Residential Construction Authorized by Permits, Units and Valuation, California and Counties*. Internet site: http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/FS_DATA/STAT-ABS/Toc_xls.htm.

[California] Department of Finance (DOF). 2005c. Demographic Information. Reports and Research Papers. City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2005, Revised 2001-04, with 2000 DRU Benchmark. Internet site: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5text2.htm>

California Department of Education (CDE). 2005. Data and Statistics on enrollment, staffing, etc. Internet site: <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>

California Employment Development Department (CEDD). 2005a. Employment by Industry Data. Internet site: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/indtable.htm>

California Employment Development Department (CEDD). 2005b. Annual Average Labor Force Data for Counties and County Sub-Areas. Internet site: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/lftable.htm>.

California Employment Development Department (CEDD). 2005c. Occupational Employment Projections. Internet site: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/?PageID=145>

Eckert, 2005. Personal Communication between Fatuma Yusuf of CH2M HILL and Phil Eckert, Business Manager/Executive Secretary, Riverside-San Bernardino County Building Trades Council. October 14.

IEEC, LLC. 2005. Inland Empire Energy Center Amendment No. 1 (GE H Technology and Additional Laydown Area). Submitted to the California Energy Commission by Inland Empire Energy Center, LLC, with technical assistance by CH2M HILL, Sacramento, CA.

McElvain, 2005. Email Communication between Fatuma Yusuf of CH2M HILL and James McElvain, Administrative Lieutenant, Riverside County Sheriff's Department. October 20.

Mendoza, 2005. Personal Communication between Fatuma Yusuf of CH2M HILL and Yvonne Mendoza, Facility Manager, Romoland Elementary School District. October 14.

Riverside County, 2005. Riverside County Budget. Internet site: http://www.co.riverside.ca.us/financial/pdf/2005/Operating_Budget_Summary.pdf

Riverside County Office of Emergency Services (OES), 2005. Internet site: <http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/opencms/facilities/OES/EOCFACSHSEETA.pdf>

Southern California Council of Governments (SCAG). 2005. 2004 RTP Growth Forecast. Internet site: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/index.htm>

Strong, J. 2005. Email communication between Fatuma Yusuf of CH2M HILL and Justin Strong, Smith Travel Research (Statistics). October 11.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Land View IV A1-T98-LVIV-22-001. Database provided by Census Bureau to determine ethnicity and poverty information for a six-mile radius around the project site.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000 Census of Population and Housing, 2000 Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1)—100-Percent data: P001. PERSONS—Universe: Persons. 01 from the American Fact Finder Detailed Tables/Selected Geography Page.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Bureau of the Census CPH-3 series of publications from the *1990 Census of Population and Housing: Population and Housing Characteristics for Census Tracts and Block Numbering Areas*. Downloaded October 19, 2001. Internet site address:
<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/ezstate/CA.pdf>

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1996. Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice.